

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Independent claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended to clarify the operation of the claimed invention. Specifically, the claims have been amended to clarify that the present invention marks the received signals as a digital signal or analog in response to the intermediate frequency of the selected channel.

Rejection of Claims 1-2, and 14 under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as anticipated by Citta (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,653).

The present invention teaches a method of processing a plurality of channels comprising the steps of "marking the selected channel as a digital signal **in response to** the intermediate frequency of the selected channel is similar to a nominal frequency for a digital signal, marking the selected channel as an analog signal **in response to** the intermediate frequency of the selected channel is similar to a nominal frequency for an analog signal" and "storing information indicative of whether the selected channel is marked as a digital or analog channel" as recited by the current claim 1.

It is submitted that Citta does not teach or suggest marking a signal digital or analog in response to the nominal IF frequency. Citta teaches a method of tuning signals in a multiformat environment by trying to tune the HDTV signal first, and if no HDTV signal is locked, the method attempts assumes the signal is an NTSC signal. (abstract) Therefore, it is submitted, that Citta determines, and marks, whether a signal is digital or analog, based on producing a high lock detect signal, not on response to the nominal IF. Citta does not teach or suggest determining if a signal is analog or digital in response to its nominal intermediate frequency.

It is submitted that claim 12 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Such action is respectfully requested. Furthermore, as claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 3 and 15 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Citta (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,653) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,762 B1).

Since claims 3 and 15 are dependent on allowable claims 1 and 12 respectively, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 12 are allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Citta (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,653) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,762 B1) further in view of Han (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,723 B1).

Since claim 4 is dependent on allowable claim 1, it is submitted that claim 4 is also are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Citta (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,653) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,762 B1) further in view of Citta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,559,898 B1).

Since claim 5 is dependent on allowable claim 1, it is submitted that claim 5 is also allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 6-7 and 16 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 6-7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Citta (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,653) in view of DeVilbiss (U.S. Patent No. 4,737,993).

Since claims 6-7 and 16 are dependent on allowable claims 1 and 12 respectively, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 12 are allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 8-9 and 11 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 8-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,762 B1) in view of Citta (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,653), and further in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,298 B1).

Kim teaches a circuit for discriminating between received signals. The circuit includes a detector for detecting a peak signal based on the degree of correlation between a received signal and a reference signal and a generator for generating a discrimination signal showing that the received signal is a high definition signal if the

peak signal is detected in a predetermined period; and showing that the received signal is a signal of an analog broadcasting method if the peak signal is not detected in the predetermined period.

Kim, similarly to Lee and Citta, neither discloses nor suggests “marking the received signals as a digital signal in response to the intermediate frequency of the selected channel is similar to a nominal frequency for a digital signal and an analog signal in response to the intermediate frequency of the selected channel is similar to a nominal frequency for an analog signal” as recited in amended claim 8 of the present invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

As claims 9 and 11 are dependent on claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 8. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 10 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,762 B1) in view of Citta (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,653), Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,298 B1) and further in view of Sugiyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,886 B1).

Since claim 10 is dependent on allowable claim 8, it is submitted that claim 10 is also allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 12 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,762 B1) in view of Citta (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,653), Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,298 B1) and further in view of Han (U.S. Patent No. 6,545,723 B1).

Since claim 12 is dependent on allowable claim 8, it is submitted that claim 12 is also allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 13 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,762 B1) in view of Citta (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,653), Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,298 B1) and further in view of Citta et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,559,898).

Since claim 13 is dependent on allowable claim 8, it is submitted that claim 13 is also allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled. If any additional fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Application No. 10/031,156
Customer No. 24498

Attorney Docket No. RCA 89645

Gene Harlow Johnson et al.

By: 

Brian J. Cromarty

Reg. No. L0027

Tel. No. (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
November 16, 2006